IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMAAR RICHARDSON, :

Petitioner, :

.

v. : CIVIL ACTION NO. 19-CV-1188

:

MARK CAPOZZA, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

AND NOW this 1st day of February 2022, upon careful and independent consideration of the petition for writ of habeas corpus, response, reply, Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation, and the objections thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**;
- 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED**; ¹ and
- 3. There is <u>no</u> basis for the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jeffrey L. Schmehl
JEFFREY L. SCHMEHL, J.

While Mr. Jamaar Richardson may not have been the main perpetrator of the underlying murder, robbery, and conspiracy, he certainly played a key role in the egregious crimes by providing substantial details about the Rite Aid to his co-conspirators. His arguments mainly quell with evidentiary rulings during and after trial, and whether his counsel was ineffective. For all the reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation, his arguments lack individual and collective merit. There is nothing that Mr. Jamaar Richardson raises that shows a deprivation of due process, an unreasonable application of Federal Law, or any unreasonable determination of facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding. Thus, I adopt the Report and Recommendation in whole, and his writ of habeas corpus is denied and dismissed.

As for Mr. Jamaar Richardson's objections to Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation and the letter I received from his cousin, Angelo Richardson, they are to no avail. None of the arguments in the objection or in Angelo's letter have any legal merit that needs to be addressed outside of Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation.

Magistrate Judge Hey's thorough Report and Recommendation properly addresses all of Mr. Jamaar Richardson's arguments. Mr. Jamaar Richardson's arguments have failed throughout all post-conviction proceedings because the law does not favor any of his arguments, and the same is true in our deferential review.